



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,937	01/29/2007	Miles Andrew Nunn	2488-I-012PCT/US	6334
23565	7590	04/15/2009	EXAMINER	
KLAUBER & JACKSON 411 HACKENSACK AVENUE HACKENSACK, NJ 07601			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	1652			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
04/15/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/558,937	Applicant(s) NUNN, MILES ANDREW
	Examiner HOPE A. ROBINSON	Art Unit 1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,6,7,9-30,32,34,35,37,38 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17,21-28,32,34,35,37,38 and 40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,6,7,9,13-16,18-20,29 and 30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 December 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No./Mail Date 10/26/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No./Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Application Status

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-16, 18-20 and 29-30) is acknowledged.
2. The traversal is on the grounds that the groups should be rejoined as applicants argue that "even with patentably distinct inventions, restriction is not required unless one of the following reasons appear (MPEP 808.02):
 1. Separate classification
 2. Separate status in the art; or
 3. Different field of search".

This argument is not persuasive as items 1-3 presented by applicant's pertain to utility applications and is not germane in PCT practice. As established in the lack of unity of record, the claimed invention lacks a special technical feature and unity of invention. Further, as evidenced below the claimed invention does not escape the prior art. Moreover under PCT Rule 13.1 applicant is entitled to the first product, method of using and making the same. Thus, the lack of unity of record is proper and is final.

Claim Disposition

3. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-30, 32, 34-35, 37-38 and 40 are pending. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-16, 18-20 and 29-30 are under examination. Claims 17, 21-28, 32, 34-35, 37-38 and 40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.12(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant is reminded that the appropriate status identifiers should be utilized as withdrawn claims are listed as "previously presented". In addition, claim 29-30 are only being examined to the extent that it pertains to the elected subject matter of the complement inhibitor polypeptide and fusion protein, applicant is urged to cancel the non-elected subject matter of "nucleic acid".

4. The Amendments filed on December 1, 2005 and January 12, 2009 have been received and entered.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification is objected to because trademarks are disclosed throughout the instant specification and not all of them are capitalized or accompanied by the generic terminology. The use of the trademarks such as Q-SEPHAROSE™, for example, have been noted in this application (see page 24). It should be capitalized wherever it

Art Unit: 1652

appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

The specification is also objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. See pages 7-8 and 28 for example. It is suggested that http:// is deleted.

The specification is objected to because of the arrangement. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

Art Unit: 1652

- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Correction is required.

Sequence Compliance

6. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825; applicant's attention is directed to the final rule making notice published at 55 FR 18230 (May 1, 1990), and 1114 OG 29 (May 15, 1990). To be in compliance, applicant is required to identify all amino acid sequences of at least 4 L-amino acids and at least 10 nucleotides by a sequence identifier, i.e., "SEQ ID NO:". The specification discloses sequences that have not been identified by a sequence identifier, see for example, pages 27-28 and 30-31. See also Figure 5. If these sequences have not been disclosed in the computer readable form of the sequence listing and the paper copy thereof, applicant must provide a computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" including these sequences, a paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification, and a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable form copies are the

Art Unit: 1652

same and, where applicable, include no new matter as required by 37 CFR 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.821(b) or 1.825(d). See the attached Notice to Comply with the sequence rules. Applicant is urged to check the copious specification for other instances where sequences may appear without the corresponding sequence identifier.

Drawing

7. The drawings filed December 1, 2005 are objected to because Figures 7a and 10 are is dark, thus difficult to discern the image. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Information Disclosure Statement

8. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 26, 2006 has been received and entered. The references cited on the PTO-1449 Form have been considered by the examiner and a copy is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Objection

9. Claims 10-11 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:
Claims 10-11 are objected to as dependent from a rejected base claim.
For clarity and precision of claim language, it is suggested that claim 13 is amended to read, "...inhibits the classical and alternative complement pathways".
Correction of the above is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claims 1, 6-7, 9, 13-16, 18-20 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-16, 18-20 and 29-30 are drawn to a complement inhibitor polypeptide, which reads on a product of nature. The claims should be amended to indicate the hand of the inventor, for example the insertion of "isolated" or "purified" in connection with the protein to identify a product not found in nature (see MPEP 2105).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-10, 13-16, 18-20 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to a compliment inhibitor polypeptide (see for example claim 1) and the claims are only defined by a functional limitation. In addition,

the claimed invention is directed to a compliment inhibitor polypeptide (see for example claim 13) comprising a homologue having at least 90% identity to SE ID NO:2 or an active fragment thereof. The claimed invention encompasses a genus of protein homologues not adequately described and a genus of fragments. No correlation is made between structure and function. The claims lack adequate written description as they are defined by function only, having no structurally limitation. Therefore, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the polypeptides, thus, claims reciting said polypeptide lacks adequate written description.

The specification fails to provide any additional representative species of the claimed genus to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, disclosure of drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, for example, structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.

Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus. The claimed genus of polypeptides could include non-functional proteins

Art Unit: 1652

or proteins with a different function than the one described. Therefore, the genus of claimed polypeptides encompasses widely variant species. Based on the unlimited variations contemplated one skilled in the art would at best expect a protein that is different or at worst a protein that is not functional.

The MPEP states that the purpose of the written description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of the filing date of the application, of the specific subject matter later claimed by him. The courts have stated:

"To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Gostelli*, 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("[T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398.

Further, for a broad generic claim, the specification must provide adequate written description to identify the genus of the claim. In *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.* the court stated:

"A written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, 'requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name,' of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials." *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601; *In re Smythe*, 480 F.2d 1376, 1383, 178 USPQ 279, 284985 (CCPA 1973) ("In other cases, particularly but not necessarily, chemical cases, where there is unpredictability in performance of certain species or subcombinations other than those specifically enumerated, one skilled in the art may be found not to have been placed in possession of a genus ...") *Regents*" of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398.

The MPEP further states that if a biomolecule is described only by a functional characteristic, without any disclosed correlation between function and structure of the sequence, it is "not sufficient characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence." MPEP § 2163. The MPEP does state that for a generic claim the genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. MPEP § 2163. If the genus has a substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within that genus. See MPEP § 2163. Although the MPEP does not define what constitute a sufficient number of representative species, the courts have indicated what do not constitute a representative number of species to adequately describe a broad generic. In *Gostelli*, the courts determined that the disclosure of two chemical compounds within a subgenus did not describe that subgenus. *In re Gostelli*, 872, F.2d at 1012, 10

Art Unit: 1652

USPQ2d at 1618. The MPEP lists factors that can be used to determine if sufficient evidence of possession has been furnished in the disclosure of the Application. These include "level of skill and knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention. Disclosure of any combination of such identifying characteristics that distinguish the claimed invention from other materials and would lead one of skill in the art to the conclusion that the applicant was in possession of the claimed species is sufficient." MPEP § 2163. While all of the factors have been considered, a sufficient amount for a *prima facie* case is discussed below.

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

12. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-10, 13-16, 18-20 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the protein set forth in SEQ ID NO: 2, does not reasonably provide enablement for any homologue of SEQ ID NO:2. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The enablement requirement refers to the requirement that the specification describe how to make and how to use the invention. There are many

factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include, but are not limited to: Quantity of Experimentation Necessary; Amount of direction or guidance presented; Presence or absence of working examples; Nature of the Invention; State of the prior art and Relative skill of those in the art; Predictability or unpredictability of the art and Breadth of the claims (see *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (*Fed. Cir.* 1988)). The factors most relevant to the instant invention are discussed below.

The amount of experimentation required to practice the claimed invention is undue as the claims encompass an unspecified amount of complement inhibitor proteins; fusion peptides/polypeptides; and homologues/ fragments of SEQ ID NO:2 absent any correlation between structure and function. The instant specification does not demonstrate or provide guidance as to what the structure of the protein will be once modified or if said protein will be functional or exhibit the same properties or characteristics as the native protein. In the instant application, the partial structure in the form of the recited percent identity is insufficient to determine a chemical structure for the variants encompassed in the claims. Additionally, there is no data provided demonstrative of a particular portion of the structure that must be conserved. Therefore, the claims encompass variants/fragments that may not have any biological activity. The specification at paragraph [0021] sets forth that a homologue of the invention "...is meant to include reference to paralogues and orthologues of the OmCl sequence that is explicitly identified in FIG. 4, including, for example, the OmCl protein

sequence from other tick species, including *Rhipicephalus appendiculatus*, *R. sanguineus*, *R. bursa*, *A. americanum*, *A. cajennense*, *A. hebraeum*, *Boophilus microplus*, *B. annulatus*, *B. decoloratus*, *Dermacentor reticulatus*, *D. andersoni*, *D. marginatus*, *D. variabilis*, *Haemaphysalis inermis*, *Ha. leachii*, *Ha. punctata*, *Hyalomma anatolicum anatolicum*, *Hy. dromedarii*, *Hy. marginatum marginatum*, *Ixodes ricinus*, *I. persulcatus*, *I. scapularis*, *I. hexagonus*, *Argas persicus*, *A. reflexus*, *Ornithodoros erraticus*, *O. moubata moubata*, *O. m. porcinus*, and *O. savignyi*. The term "homologue" is also meant to include the OmCI protein sequence from mosquito species, including those of the *Culex*, *Anopheles* and *Aedes* genera, particularly *Culex quinquefasciatus*, *Aedes aegypti* and *Anopheles gambiae*; flea species, such as *Ctenocephalides felis* (the cat flea); horseflies; sandflies; blackflies; tsetse flies; lice; mites; leeches; and flatworms". At paragraph [0024] of the specification it is disclosed that homologues include mutants containing amino acid substitutions, insertions or deletions from the wild type sequence. Note the laundry list of organisms provided by the specification, however, only an OMCI protein is demonstrated.

Moreover at paragraph [0025] of the specification it is disclosed that "fragments of the OmCI protein and of homologues of the OmCI protein are also provided by the invention. Included as such fragments are not only fragments of the *O. moubata* OmCI protein that is explicitly identified herein in FIG. 4, but also fragments of homologues of this protein, as described above". Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to generate the infinite number of variants/fragments recited in the claims and possibly screen same for activity and the lack of guidance/direction provided in the

instant specification, this is merely an invitation to the skilled artisan to use the current invention as a starting point for further experimentation. Thus, undue experimentation would be required for a skilled artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Predictability of which potential changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (for example, expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the protein's structure relates to its function. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, for example, multiple substitutions. In this case, the necessary guidance has not been provided in the specification. Therefore, while it is known in the art that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the positions within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of success are limited, as certain positions in the sequence are critical to the protein's structure/function relationship. It is also known in the art that a single nucleotide or amino acid change or mutation can destroy the function of the biomolecule in many cases. For example, various sites or regions directly involved in binding activity and in providing the correct three-dimensional spatial orientation of binding and active sites can be affected (see Wells, Biochemistry, vol. 29, pages 8509-8517, 1990). The instant specification provides no guidance/direction as to which regions of the protein

Art Unit: 1652

would be tolerant of modifications and which would not, and it provides no working examples of any variant sequence that is encompassed by the claims. It is in no way predictable that randomly selected mutations, such as deletions, substitutions, additions, etc., in the disclosed sequences would result in a protein having activity comparable to the one disclosed. As plural substitutions for example are introduced, their interactions with each other and their effects on the structure and function of the protein is unpredictable. The skilled artisan would recognize the high degree of unpredictability that all the fragments/variants encompassed in the claims would retain the recited function.

The state of the prior art provides evidence for the high degree of unpredictability as stated above. Seffernick et al. (J. Bacteriology, vol. 183, pages 2405-2410, 2001) disclose two polypeptides having 98% sequence identity and 99% sequence identity, differing at only 9 out of 475 amino acids (page 2407, right column, middle and page 2408, Fig. 3). The polypeptides of Seffernick et al. are identical along relatively long stretches of their respective sequences (page 2408, Fig. 3), however, these polypeptides exhibit distinct functions. The modifications exemplified in the Seffernick et al. reference is small compared to those contemplated and encompassed by the claimed invention.

The specification lacks adequate guidance/direction to enable a skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims. Furthermore, while recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known in the art, it is not routine in the art to screen large numbers of mutated proteins where the expectation of obtaining

Art Unit: 1652

similar activity is unpredictable based on the instant disclosure. The amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, and predictability of what mutations can be tolerated in a protein's sequence and result in certain activity, which is very complex, and well outside the realm of routine experimentation, because accurate predictions of a protein's function from mere sequence data are limited, therefore, the general knowledge and skill in the art is not sufficient, thus the specification needs to provide an enabling disclosure.

The working examples provided do not rectify the missing information in the instant specification pertaining to the claimed variant. The nature and properties of this claim is difficult to ascertain from the examples provided as one of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to construct the variants of the claimed invention and examine the same for function.

The specification does not provide support for the broad scope of the claims, which encompass an unspecified amount of variants/fragments of the polypeptides. The claims broadly read on any fragment thereof for the given sequences (SEQ ID NO: 2). At issue in this case is the breadth of the claims in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the skill level artisan and the guidance presented in the instant specification and the prior art of record. This make and test position is inconsistent with the decisions of *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) where it is stated that "...scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art...". Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired

biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Thus, for all these reasons, the specification is not considered to be enabling for one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention as the amount of experimentation required is undue, due to the broad scope of the claims, the lack of guidance and working examples provided in the specification and the high degree of unpredictability as evidenced by the state of the prior art, attempting to construct and test variants/homologues of the claimed invention would constitute undue experimentation. Making and testing the infinite number of possible variants to find one that functions as described is undue experimentation. Therefore, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner that reasonably correlates with the scope of the claims, to be considered enabling.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1652

13. Claims 1 and 6-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Asghar et al. (*Molecular Immunology*, vol. 23, No. 5, pages 459-465, 1986, cited on the IDS filed on October 26, 2006).

Asghar et al. discloses the inhibition of complement by a series of substituted 2-aryl-1,3-indandiones: interaction with the fifth component of complement, thus C5 s inhibited. Drug effects on complement activation is measured. The references discloses the complement in activators indandiones worked on both the classical and alternative complement pathways. Further the reference discloses that the main site of inhibition in the complement cascade appeared to be C5 (see page 459). Therefore, the limitations of the claims are met by the reference.

Conclusion

14. No claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat Nashed, can be reached at (571) 272-0934.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hope A. Robinson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652